

1964

It may be argued that these three words are unnecessary, that any court of appeals would say that in order for the use of any waters to be free, free access to the waters should be required. However, we cannot afford to rely carelessly on a court interpretation. We should make this technical correction here and now. It is simply obvious that if the use of waters is to be available to the people without fees, the people must have free access to the shoreline of any reservoir or other body of water.

This amendment will not interfere in any way with the collection of entrance or admission fees at areas that are adjacent to bodies of water and that are administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural or recreational purposes. The bill provides for the collection of fees for the use of facilities such as boat ramps, moorings, boat-houses, improved campsites, bathhouses, or other improvements which add safety and convenience for the user. Such fees already are charged in many of our State and Federal parks and recreational areas. Although I feel this bill delegates power in an undesirable fashion for the levying of additional fees of this kind, the Senate committee removed one of the most objectionable features when it added the provision that no fee of any kind shall be charged for the use of any waters.

The difficulty which my amendment is designed to avoid is an obvious possibility. Somewhere, somehow in years to come some bureaucrat might seek to circumvent our purpose by fencing off a body of water in such a way that even though the use of the water itself was free, no one could make use of the water without first paying a toll fee to reach the shoreline. My amendment, adding the words "or access thereto," rules out such a possibility. It will eliminate the need for some court to assume at some future date the responsibility of telling the people of this country what we meant when we said that no fee would be charged for the use of any water. I am sure that all of us would agree that any steps we can take here to make court interpretations of our actions unnecessary in the future will be warmly welcomed by the American people.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Inasmuch as the Senator from Oklahoma and I have been concerned with the same problem, and in view of the fact that I had prepared a much more awkward and cumbersome amendment, I should like to be included as a cosponsor of his amendment, and then I shall not offer mine.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would very much appreciate having the distinguished Senator from South Dakota join me in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma and cosponsored by the Senator from South Dakota will be helpful in clarifying what the committee definitely intended to make very clear, namely, the right of accessibility to waters, without charge. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. This body of legislators has on at least seven separate occasions stated the principle of free use of the public waters for the public. And as late as 1960, the Democratic Party, which I am a proud member, enacted the same principle in its platform. We have adopted the principle in

the multiple-use development of forests, fish and wildlife refuges, and reservoirs.

Our present system of financing recreation facilities has worked well. It has provided excellent facilities throughout all parts of the country. The Congress has retained the control over financing which is its responsibility and prerogative. Of course, more could have been done if more money had been provided. In recent years the Congress has recognized the need for these facilities. Having recognized the need, I believe the Congress will provide the necessary funds.

I am advised by the Corps of Engineers that they have more than 300 completed projects with recreation facilities throughout the United States. In 1963 there were 130 million visitor-days attendance at these reservoir projects. There is no fee charged for the use of the impounded water or for access to it. The corps has contracts with 540 private concessionaires who furnish such things as overnight and vacation accommodations, boat rental and service, snackbars and stores, fish tackle and bait, and other needed services for which fees are charged. But there is no entrance fee to any of these projects. There is no charge for the minimal service and facilities furnished by the corps, such as boat launching ramps, camp tables, drinking fountains, and things of that nature. There should be no fee charged for this type of facility or service, nor should any fee be imposed for access to the water areas. Certainly a citizen should be able to expect from his Government this nominal benefit from the expenditure of tax money to develop natural resources. Is there some fault with what we have been doing since the enactment of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 or with what we have reenacted as late as the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1962?

Oklahoma has been a leader in developing recreational facilities. It has developed 18 State parks and recreational areas on and around the Federal reservoirs in Oklahoma. Seventy-five million dollars in State funds have been invested in our park system, \$25 million of which is in revenue bonds. We have a total of 17 State parks and 15 State recreation areas. There were over 28 million visitor-days attendance last year at recreation areas in Oklahoma. About 16 million of these visitor-days were at Corps of Engineers projects. The system of financing in Oklahoma which is a combination of direct appropriations and revenue bonds has worked satisfactorily.

The State has never found it necessary to resort to entrance fees of any kind or a charge for the use of the water.

The policy of the Corps of Engineers in determining recreation benefits and development grew out of the efforts of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr to meet the recreational needs at corps projects and to assure the full development of the resources involved. It is the same theory that resulted in the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the policy of multiple use of our national forest lands.

I for one do not believe that we need to or should charge fees to areas traditionally free. These resources belong to the people—why should we deprive any of them of their enjoyment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the senior Senator from New York for yielding me the time in which to present the conference report.

HUBERT HUMPHREY—A GOOD CHOICE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there is a newspaper in my State, the Lewiston Morning Tribune, published in Lewiston, Idaho, which I believe can properly be referred to as the thinking man's newspaper.

Recently two editorials of such exceptional quality have appeared in the Tribune that I believe they deserve inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first editorial appeared under date of Thursday, August 27, 1964. It is entitled, "Hubert Humphrey—A Good Choice." The last paragraph of the editorial reads:

We should all hope that the practice of nominating a qualified man for the Vice-Presidency will be a continuing one in American politics. President Johnson and the Democratic Party are to be commended for selecting a vice-presidential candidate possessing proven statesmanship as well as voter appeal.—B.E.N.

I not only wholeheartedly agree with the concluding paragraph of the editorial, but I also agree with all other parts of this excellent editorial. I commend it to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Aug. 27, 1964]

HUBERT HUMPHREY—A GOOD CHOICE

The nomination of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY as the Democratic vice presidential candidate should be welcomed by all Americans regardless of party. It means that President Johnson and the Democratic Party have seen fit to select a man who could fulfill the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency in the case of Presidential death or disability.

The longtime custom of selecting a vice-presidential candidate to add "balance" to the ticket or to pick up a few extra votes from a regional or ethnic minority is an archaic political practice which America can well do without. The American Vice President has had to assume the duties of the President on the death of the Head of State on eight different occasions. In recent years the selection of vice-presidential candidates of the quality of Alben Barkley, Earl Warren,

Richard Nixon, Estes Kefauver, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Lyndon Johnson is especially commendable where one considers that the President literally possesses the power of life and death over the population of his own country and over much of the world. The presidential and vice-presidential candidates of both parties should be men of proven ability and prudence.

HUMPHREY has had a record of proven ability since his election to the Senate in 1948. The esteem of his fellow Democratic Senators is indicated by their election of the Minnesotan as Democratic "whip" in 1961, a position second in rank only to the majority leader. This year, President Johnson designated HUMPHREY to manage the highly controversial civil rights bill on the floor of the Senate and HUMPHREY brilliantly steered the bill to final passage this summer.

Although HUMPHREY expresses his convictions with firmness, he does so without alienating those who differ with him. During the civil rights struggle HUMPHREY would caution his aids, "Be nice to people." HUMPHREY's gregarious disposition has paid off handsomely for him; he has retained the friendship of southern politicians who vigorously opposed his civil rights stand. Indeed, since the first trial balloon was launched for the Humphrey candidacy earlier this year, almost no opposition has emerged in the South or in any other section of the country. Many Democratic professionals approvingly remember how HUMPHREY swallowed his pride and worked for the Democratic presidential nominee after Kennedy defeated him for the nomination in 1960. And in the Senate, HUMPHREY was one of President Kennedy's strongest legislative backers.

Although HUMPHREY has great support among the liberal, urban, and intellectual elements in the Democratic Party, he is also popular with farmers and businessmen. Born the son of a smalltown South Dakota pharmacist, he learned the problems of the businessman and the farmer early in life. HUMPHREY was a pharmacist, college teacher, and mayor of Minneapolis before his election to the Senate.

HUMPHREY also is experienced in foreign affairs, a requisite for any prospective American President. A member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee since 1953, he has written scholarly articles on foreign affairs and has worked hard for the United Nations, for foreign assistance, for arms control agreements, and for good relations with Latin America. The July issue of Foreign Affairs contains a thoughtful article by HUMPHREY urging increased American attention to the problem of promoting peaceful social change in Latin America to prevent the spread of Castroism.

We should all hope that the practice of nominating a qualified man for the Vice-Presidency will be a continuing one in American politics. President Johnson and the Democratic Party are to be commended for selecting a vice-presidential candidate possessing proven statesmanship as well as voter appeal.—B.E.N.

NEW HAND AT THE HELM IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, an editorial appeared in the Lewiston Morning Tribune under date of Sunday, August 30, 1964, entitled, "New Hand at the Helm in Vietnam."

The editorial contains an excellent summary of the distressing situation which is facing us in that unhappy country. I concur completely in the summary and the factual presentation made in the editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Aug. 30, 1964]

NEW HAND AT THE HELM IN VIETNAM

Dr. Nguyen Xuan Oanh's ascension to the premiership of South Vietnam is the latest symptom of the disturbing political situation in that country. The sad fact is that no South Vietnamese Government for the last few years has been able to command the loyalty of the majority of the population.

Those who advocate an expansion of the war to North Vietnam or China fail to perceive this aspect of the conflict. The Vietcong guerrillas are primarily South Vietnamese, and arm themselves largely with American weapons captured from the South Vietnamese Army. Any guerrilla force is dependent on the support of the South Vietnamese peasantry for survival. As Henry Cabot Lodge, the 1960 Republican vice presidential candidate and recent Ambassador to South Vietnam, has pointed out: "The Vietcong campaign is, above all, a political affair . . . When the Vietcong have had enough and decide to stop fighting, they simply riot in with the people. If the people were to deny the Vietcong, they would thus have no base; they would be through."

American political and military leaders have increasingly realized the importance of nonmilitary factors in winning the war against the Vietcong. Earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara noted that the large indigenous support the guerrillas received necessitated political and economic measures as well as military ones, and that there could be no purely military solution in South Vietnam.

U.S. assistance to South Vietnam originated in 1954 when President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles made the decision to take over from the French, who had been defeated by the Communists on the battlefield. The Diem regime in South Vietnam had a promising beginning but steadily began to lose touch with the people of the country in the late 1950's; it finally fell in the wake of the Buddhist demonstrations last year. Since November, South Vietnam has had three political leaders, hardly a situation to encourage the people to fight the Vietcong.

Hopefully, Dr. Oanh will be able to help develop the political consensus necessary to stabilize his country. Dr. Oanh, who speaks fluent English, has a doctorate in economics from Harvard, and who served as an instructor in a Connecticut college for 5 years, will be able to establish close communication with his American allies. At the same time he must strive to maintain an appearance of independence so that he will not be branded an "American tool" by his own countrymen.

The main advantage in this conflict as compared to the French war against Ho Chi Minh's forces, is that now the Vietnamese are carrying the brunt of the battle against the Communists themselves. In the early 1950's, the Vietnamese supporters of the French were continually discredited by being labeled as agents of Western imperialism. Increased American military involvement would only make it more difficult to inspire the people to do battle against the Vietcong guerrilla force.

It is probably futile to expect that the present administration will make any major political or diplomatic move to help meet the South Vietnamese crisis before our own presidential election. But it would be beneficial to begin exploring possible political steps. Several Members of the U.S. Senate have advocated more effort in this area, including the suggestion to bring the United Nations into a greater role in the settlement of the dispute. Certainly, blind repetition of current military effort is not promising.

In any case, Americans must keep cool heads in this crisis. They must not be misled by campaign declarations that expansion of the war to the north will defeat the Vietcong in the south. In making his decisive air response to the attack on American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson wisely reiterated the long-term American policy of seeking no wider war in the Indochinese Peninsula.

Americans also should wish Dr. Oanh success; like his predecessors, he can count on ample American support. We should also hope that he, his fellow countrymen, and all politicians here at home fully realize the realities of the conflict. If the war in South Vietnam is to be won, the South Vietnamese themselves must win it. No real solution can be achieved by greater use of Western arms in the struggle for Vietnam.—B.E.N.

JEWISH NEW YEAR 5725

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with the advent of the Jewish year 5725, my family joins me in extending our warm wishes to the Jewish community for a year of happiness and fulfillment. May all, especially those abroad undergoing hardship and persecution, have a year of freedom, peace and justice.

In this High Holy Day season especially, all Americans of good faith join in prayer that the Soviets will loosen the bonds confining some 3 million of her Jewish citizens so they might once again experience the enjoyment of their religious heritage and the faith that sustained their fathers.

May this year be a blessed and peaceful one in which all acknowledge the common brotherhood of man and the common fatherhood of God.

I deem it appropriate on this occasion to reiterate that I shall continue to protest against the religious and cultural discriminations which the Jews of the Soviet Union endure. It is my profound prayer that the Soviet Government will rectify, as quickly as possible, the evil persecutions of their Jewish citizens. What is required is not official denials of the existence of anti-Semitism, but rather official action to restore to Soviet Jewry religious and cultural freedom—the freedoms which all other peoples in Soviet Russia experience.

The singular sentiment of American Jews for peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors is well known. I join with them in the fervent hope that, during this coming year, decisive progress will be made toward peace with justice in the Middle East. To this end, Arab statesmen must realize that the State of Israel is a permanent polity internationally recognized as a fruitful member of the family of nations. Arab recognition of this international fact will not only remove the dangerous tensions which beset that region but will likewise be a wise and constructive contribution to the peace of the whole world. Again—a happy New Year.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Order of AHEPA, assembled at the 4th Annual Supreme Convention in Toronto, Canada, unanimously approved a number of important resolutions dealing with